1 The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 **BOTIMA MANGUNGU and GRACE** No. C03-1053P MANGUNGU. 10 DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. Plaintiffs, TRAN IN REPLY REGARDING 11 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF 12 TIME V. CITY OF SEATTLE; SEATTLE POLICE 13 **NOTED ON MOTION CALENDAR:** DEPARTMENT; OFFICER TOM CONRAD WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2004 and JANE DOE CONRAD, husband and 14 wife and the marital community composed 15 thereof; and SERGEANT STEVEN JANDOC and JANE DOE JANDOC, husband and wife and the marital 16 community composed thereof. 17 Defendants. 18 JENNIFER A. TRAN declares as follows: 19 20 1. I am one of the attorneys of record for the defendant City of Seattle and make this declaration of my own personal knowledge. 21 22 By Minute Order dated March 12, 2004 (Dkt. 44), defendant City of Seattle 2. 23 was ordered to produce IIS documents relating to complaints of assaults and unlawful DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN Stafford Frey Cooper REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION ATTORNEYS OF TIME - C03-1053P - 1 3100 Two Union Square 601 Union Street U:\CLIENTS\3019\24597\PLD MOT4 EXTENSION OF TIME -JAT DEC.DOC SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-1374

Tel. (206) 623-9900 Fax (206) 624-6885 OF TIME - C03-1053P - 2
U:\CLIENTS\3019\24597\PLD MOT4 EXTENSION OF TIME -JAT DEC.DOC

DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN

REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION

detentions for one year preceding April 23, 2001. Defendant City of Seattle was further ordered to prepare and submit a log with the documents describing why each should be protected.

- 3. On April 15, 2004, defendant City of Seattle submitted 56 IIS files for *in camera* review, along with a confidential memorandum setting forth its bases why said documents should not to be disclosed. Prior to the IIS files being produced for the court's *in camera* review, attorneys (and/or staff of attorneys) for defendant City of Seattle highlighted portions of the files which contained privileged identifying information of the complainant where confidentiality was sought by the complainant, identifying information of the named employees, civilian witnesses and police officer witnesses. This task was undertaken by three attorneys and one staff member who spent approximately 94 hours reviewing and highlighting the IIS documents. To promptly produce these files to the court, attorneys and staff worked through the evening hours.
- 4. On Thursday, April 29, 2004, the court entered its Order Re: Internal Investigation Files. The city received electronic notification of the order the next day, Friday April 30, 2004 at approximately 1:30 p.m. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the electronic notification I received. The court ordered the city to produce the IIS files to plaintiff "within 7 days of the entry of this order," thereby rendering the materials due by Thursday, May 6, 2004.
- 5. Upon receipt of the Order Re: Internal Investigation Files, I sought help from attorneys and legal assistants at my firm to help complete the task ordered by the court. By Monday, I was only able to enlist two staff members who could volunteer several hours to help me complete this task. They began redacting the portions that the

STAFFORD FREY CO OPER

Professional Corporation

A T T O R N E Y S

3100 TWO UNION SQUARE
601 UNION STREET

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-1374

TEL. (206) 623-9900

FAX (206) 624-6885

city had previously highlighted when the IIS files were originally produced to the court. Upon realization that the information that had previously been highlighted was not addressed by the court's order, I immediately called the court on Monday, May 3, 2004, seeking clarification of the order as it related to civilian witnesses, police officer witnesses, medical records and criminal history records. If there had been sufficient time to formally move for clarification or reconsideration of the court's order, without technically violating the deadline imposed by the court, I would have filed either a motion for reconsideration or motion for clarification without telephoning the court. During this call, I was told that I must formally move for clarification if one was needed. The city filed its motion for clarification and extension of time that same day (Dkt. 65) and was required by the local rule to note its motion for consideration 7 judicial days from the filing of the motion. Accordingly, the motion for clarification and motion for extension of time was noted May 12, 2004.

On Tuesday, May 4, 2004, I received a call from the court noting that the court did not intend the order to allow for the redaction of any identifying information regarding civilian witnesses or police officer witnesses, nor did the court intend the order to preclude the disclosure of medical records or criminal history records. I was asked whether the city still wished to have the court consider the motion for clarification. I informed the court that the motion for clarification was moot in light of the court's oral clarification but that the city still wished to pursue its motion for an extension of time. That same day the court issued a minute order (Dkt. 66) clarifying its previous order regarding the redaction and production of the 56 IIS files. The court struck the city's

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - C03-1053P - 4

substantive portion of the motion and deferred ruling on the extension of time until plaintiff had the opportunity to respond.

- 7. Due to the court's clarification of its previous order, IIS files which my staff and I had already redacted were totally discarded and the process of redacting the IIS documents pursuant to the court's minute order (Dkt. 66) began again in earnest. Because the court's order allowed for redaction of information that was *different* from what the city had previously highlighted, the city was required to re-review each file and only redact identifying information pertaining to the complainant and the named employee. Due to the limited time to produce documents, a total of six staff members have devoted a portion of their time to this task. Throughout this process, we diligently worked to meet the court's deadline. I personally took IIS files home with me and on one occasion stayed up until 2:00 a.m. to redact identifying information. I am aware that one staff member took IIS files with her to the hospital to work on while her son was in surgery. My team worked diligently in an attempt to meet the court's deadline and spent approximately an additional 70.5 billable hours working on the project.
- 8. The city moved for an extension of time to produce the documents in large part because the city's motion for clarification could not be noted until May 12, 2004, six (6) days after the time in which the city was required to perform. Even if the city had not moved for clarification, the task of redacting 55 IIS files is an extremely time-consuming task. An extension of time was necessary in light of the enormous task of re-reviewing each of the 55 IIS file, page-by-page, and line-by-line. The task was not only time-consuming but also exhausting to the eyes. Because there was a high chance of missing identifying information during the first round of redacting, we were required to

Stafford Frey Co oper

A T T O R N E Y S

3100 Two Union Square
601 Union Street

Seattle, Washington 98101-1374

Tel. (206) 623-9900
Fax (206) 624-6885

1	skim each of the files again to catch any errors. The city did not intend to unjustly delay
2	trial of this matter nor did it intend to disregard the deadline imposed by the court
3	Rather, the city intended to comply with the spirit of the court's order while preserving
4	the interests of the client and privacy rights of the individuals involved with each of the
5	55 IIS files.
6	I declare under penalty of perjury according to the laws of the State o
7	Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.
8	DATED this 11 th day of May, 2004, at Seattle, Washington.
9	
10	/s/Jennifer A. Tran via ECF Jennifer A. Tran
11	Jennier A. Tran
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A TRANSIN STAFFORD ENEW COOPER

DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - C03-1053P - 5
U:\CLIENTS\3019\24597\PLD MOT4 EXTENSION OF TIME -JAT DEC.DOC

A T T O R N E Y S

3100 TWO UNION SQUARE
601 UNION STREET
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-1374
TEL. (206) 623-9900
FAX (206) 624-6885

1	<u>Certificate of Service</u>
2 3	I certify that on the date noted below I presented DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME to the Clerk of the Court for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following persons:
4	Andrew Schwarz <u>awslaw@wolfnet.com</u>
5	119 - 1st Avenue, #320 Seattle, WA 98104 (206) 622-9909
6	FAX: (206) 622-6636 Attorney for Plaintiffs
7 8	and I certify that I have caused to be served in the manner noted below a copy of the above-listed document to the following non CM/ECF participants:
9	
10	[] Via Facsimile [] Via First Class Mail [] Via Messenger
11	DATED this day of May, 2004, at Seattle, Washington.
12	
13	//
14	/s/ Jennifer A. Tran, via ECF Jennifer A. Tran, WSBA #28756
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	DECLARATION OF JENNIFER A. TRAN IN REPLY REGARDING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - C03-1053P - 6 U:\CLIENTS\\3019\\24597\PLD MOT4 EXTENSION OF TIME -JAT DEC.DOC STAFFORD FREY CO OPER A T T O R N E Y S 3100 TWO UNION SQUARE 601 UNION STREET SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-1374 TEL. (206) 623-9900

FAX (206) 624-6885